

## REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 13 and 14 stand rejected. Claims 2, 3, 6, 11, 12, and 15 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Gorshe et al. (6.667,973). The Examiner has kindly pointed out where the Gorshe et al. reference supposedly illustrates the elements of the rejected claims.

Referring first to claim 1, the Examiner states that the claimed “at least one control line” is either the intra-shelf common control bus shown in Fig. 1b of Gorshe et al. or the PCM control signal 104 shown in Fig. 1a of Gorshe et al. He further states that he “interprets” Gorshe et al. col. 6, lines 10-13 and col. 11, lines 31-33 and 39-42 to read on the claimed “said at least one control line being asserted when valid data from one of said asynchronous data streams appears in a slot of said repeating bus frame.” [Emphasis added.

The portion of column 6 cited by the Examiner states that “FIG. 1a also illustrates PCM control signals 104 which include the per-bus byte status signal, a global PCM bus clock, and global receive and transmit SONET frame synchronization signals.” The PCM control signals are never mentioned again in the reference. The portions of col. 11 cited by the Examiner state that “Each LSU, has a unique point during the cell slot to make its

arbitration request. Specifically, each LSU has two clock cycles on the ATM\_ARB line during which it can log its request to transmit a cell... [and] In the preferred embodiment, the HSU acts as the master for bus arbitration and is responsible for choosing which LSU will place its cell into the next cell slot, however, any unit on the PCM buses could act as the master.” If the Examiner is interpreting the PCM control signals to be the claimed “at least one control line” there is no indication in Gorshe et al. that any of these signals are asserted when data from an asynchronous data stream appears in a slot. If the Examiner is interpreting the intra-shelf common control bus to be the claimed “at least one control line” there is no indication in Gorshe et al. that any of these signals are asserted when data from an asynchronous data stream appears in a slot. The cited portions of col. 11 appear to be referring to an arbitration scheme where an LSU requests a “cell slot”. The requests are made before asynchronous data appears in a slot, not when the data appears in the slot as claimed herein.

From the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that Gorshe et al. neither anticipates nor suggests claim 1. As claims 4, 5, and 7-9 depend from claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Gorshe et al.

Independent claim 10 is a method claim containing four steps. The last step is “asserting a first control line when valid data from one of the asynchronous data streams appears in a slot of the repeating bus frame” which corresponds to the wherein clause in claim 1. In rejecting claim 10, the Examiner cites the same portions of cols. 6 and 11 as

discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable for the same reasons as stated regarding claim 1.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10 and the remarks made above regarding claim 10 apply to these claims as well.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David P. Gordon".

David P. Gordon  
Reg. No. 29,996  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.  
60 Long Ridge Road  
Suite 407  
Stamford, CT 06902  
Tel: (203) 323-1800

July 5, 2006